

REMARKS

Claims 11-15, 17-23, 36-39, 42-58, 60-65, 68-73, 83-90, 92, 93, 95-101, 103, and 106-133 were pending in this application. Claims 11-15, 17-23, 36-39, 42-48, 52, 54, 57, 58, 60-65, 68-73, 83-87, 92, 93, 95, 96 and 114-133 have been allowed. Claims 99, 100 and 108-110 were objected to only as being dependent upon rejected base claims, and were said to be allowable if suitably rewritten in independent form. Claims 97, 98, 101, 103, 106, 107 and 111-113 have been rejected. Claims 15, 36, 57, 58, 62, 87, 92, 95 and 97 are independent.

By this Amendment Applicants seek to cancel claims 97-113. Such cancellation is solely to obtain prompt allowance of this application, and should not be construed as an admission that those claims are unpatentable. Applicants reserve the right to later pursue any or all of the cancelled claims in a related continuation application.

The Examiner is thanked for the allowance of claims 11-15, 17-23, 36-39, 42-48, 52, 54, 57, 58, 60-65, 68-73, 83-87, 92, 93, 95, 96 and 114-133 (since the Office Action summary sheet states all of these claims are allowed; the reference to allowed claims "42-58, 60-65" in the body of the Office Action at page 6 is understood to be in error). Those claims have been maintained unchanged, and so are believed to remain in condition for allowance at least for the reasons given previously.

The Examiner is also thanked for the indicated allowability of claims 99, 100 and 108-110. As noted above, those claims have been cancelled to expedite allowance of this case.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 97-101, 103 and 106-113 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter of Applicants' invention. The Office Action pointed out a claim feature which was deemed to be unclear.

Claims 97-101, 103 and 106-113 have all been cancelled, meaning this rejection is now entirely moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Rejection Under
35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 97, 98, 101, 103, 106, 107 and 111-113 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,790,158 to Shinada et al.

Claims 97, 98, 101, 103, 106, 107 and 111-113 have all been cancelled, meaning this rejection is now entirely moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place this application in condition for allowance. If, however, the Examiner deems this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below to resolve any outstanding issues prior to issuing a further Office Action.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this paper. Nevertheless, should the Commissioner deem any fees to be now or hereafter due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge all such fees to Deposit Account No. 19-4709.

Respectfully submitted,
/David L. Schaeffer/
David L. Schaeffer
Registration No. 32,716
Attorney for Applicants
STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP
180 Maiden Lane
New York, New York 10038-4982
(212) 806-6677